

VZCZCXRO7854
PP RUEHRN
DE RUEHNR #4710/01 3441433
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 101433Z DEC 07
FM AMEMBASSY NAIROBI
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3809
RUEHJB/AMEMBASSY BUJUMBURA 0301
INFO RUEHBS/AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS 1907
RUEHRN/USMISSION UN ROME 0229
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 4282

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 NAIROBI 004710

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

USAID/DCHA FOR MHESS, GGOTTLIEB
DCHA/OFDA FOR KLUU, ACONVERY, KCHANNELL
DCHA/FFP FOR JDWORKEN, SANTHONY, CMUTAMBA, TMCRAE
USMISSION UN ROME FOR RNEWBERG
GENEVA FOR NKYLOH
USAID/ECARO FOR JMYER, ADWYER
BUJUMBURA FOR PMOLLER, JANDERSON

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [BY](#)

SUBJECT: MYAP GUIDANCE MEETING AND KEY CHALLENGES IN
BURUNDI

¶1. On October 23, 2007, USAID/East Africa/Food for Peace (FFP) held an information meeting with potential Title II Multi Year Assistance Program (MYAP) partners in Burundi. This is the first year that Burundi is on the FFP Priority List of 18 countries designated to program Title II non-emergency resources. Burundi is recovering from 13 years of civil war that has impoverished the population, making them susceptible to the recurrent shocks of internal displacement, drought, and floods. As Burundi transitions slowly from emergency programs, USAID/FFP seeks to contribute to the relief-to-development process currently underway in Burundi through the programming of MYAPs.

¶2. This was the third in a series of meetings held with potential partners to introduce the concept of MYAPs and provide guidance for their submissions. As participating partners finalize food security assessments and program designs, and FFP updated the Bellmon Analysis for Burundi as well as the final MYAP FY 08 Guidelines made recently available for the January 21, 2008 submission deadline, this was an opportune time to hold a final consultative meeting. The participants were very appreciative of the guidance and support and the notes and handouts of the meeting were sent to all who communicated with FFP in the last year, as well as posted to the USAID/East Africa website for in order to maintain transparency and fairness for all applicants.

¶3. The meeting was attended by seven PVOs and the complement team of USAID/Burundi, USAID/East Africa/Limited Presence Countries Office and Regional Food for Peace Officers Denise Gordon, who serves as the regional back stop officer for Burundi, and David Rinck, who has extensive experience in the development of MYAPs and Bellmon Analysis.

¶4. The meeting centered on the following issues:
-- Proposals should be in support of FFP's overall Strategic Objective of reducing food insecurity in vulnerable populations, underscoring the program areas FFP will consider in program designs;
-- Required monitoring and evaluating indicators: F process, mission, FFP, and trigger indicators;

-- Encouragement of integration with USAID/Burundi's relevant Functional Objectives, as described in the Burundi Operational Plan (OP). Specifically, the Title II program is expected to support Burundi's Economic Growth (EG) and Investing in People (IIP) Objectives in the Program Areas of Agriculture and Health;

-- Leveraging of funding requests from FFP with other USAID/Burundi programs including the Burundi Agribusiness Program and the Burundi Maternal and Child Health Program, as well as other USAID funding sources and other donors;

-- integrating as much as possible with regional and country initiatives such as the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) with its objective of diminishing the root causes of food security. In the case of Burundi this initiative is still being developed;

-- Providing an update on the FY08 Bellmon Analysis that identified the commodities most appropriate for distribution to include peas, maize and maize meal.

Monetized commodities should be limited to 12,000 MTs of Hard Red Wheat (HRW);

-- Encouraging potential partners to examine existing food pipelines (such as WFP) before deciding to establish a supplementary one.

--Relaying the importance of establishing one lead monetization agent following the award to discourage partners from competing against each other.

Additionally relaying that monetization should not lead the process but rather fill the gap that exists after identifying the program interventions. After the appropriate 202(e) and Internal Transport, Storage and Handling (ITSH) and other funding have been applied, the remaining gap should justify/support the need for monetization.

NAIROBI 00004710 002 OF 002

¶15. The consultative meeting for potential MYAP partners also highlighted the strong and positive partnership of the various offices of USAID that are promoting Burundi's development. The meeting established an important foundation for the integration of FFP activities with USAID/Burundi's priorities. However, as this groundwork is laid, it raises other questions that are highlighted below.

CHALLENGES: IMPORTANT LESSONS LEARNED AND QUESTIONS RAISED

¶16. The F process has challenged Title II non-emergency food aid programs. On the one hand FFP requests that partners submit unsolicited proposals that respond to a wide range of activities aimed at reducing food insecurity. Partners are only ?encouraged? to align their program designs with USAID Missions. However, if USAID/Burundi must monitor and report on all development programming, and those program areas and elements are determined by USAID/Burundi, then are the potential MYAP partners obligated to follow the programming priorities of USAID/Burundi? This is not explicitly stated, but current reporting processes suggest it will happen this way.

¶17. As Burundi's preliminary FY08 Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) allocated the total FFP development funding level (\$5 million) in the Program Area of Economic Growth for FY08, the FFP team questioned whether it could tell potential partners that they could submit program designs that focused on health and nutrition or other elements under the Program Area of Investing in People. Following many phone calls to Washington, we were informed that there was flexibility to make those desired changes as long as there was support from the field Missions.

¶18. Finally, an important observation made during the development of the Burundi MYAPs was that the Foreign Assistance and Operational Plan reporting system as it is currently configured may not accurately and fully capture the unique qualities of food aid as a non-emergency (or development) resource. For example, in Burundi the Title II program is envisioned to support the Program Areas of Agriculture and Health. However, within these program areas, USAID/Burundi will employ both cash and food aid. Each of these resources has specific advantages and limitations which a quantitative reporting system will not fully reflect.

FSN Food Aid Monitor

¶19. In an effort to support USAID/Burundi with this new food aid programming as well as provide continued monitoring of WFP's Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRRO), FFP plans to fund a Foreign Service National Food Aid Monitor.

RANNEBERGER